

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the attention accorded to the instant application, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as amended.

Formal Matters

Claims 1 and 4-12 are the claims currently pending in the Application. Claims 1, 5, 11 and 12 are amended; support for these amendments can be found in the specification on page 16, lines 7-8 and in Figures 4 (lists 27 and 28), 6, and 7.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,892,193 by Bolle, et al., (hereinafter "Bolle") further in view of U.S. Patent 7,051,277 by Kephart et al., (hereinafter "Kephart").

The claimed system has an inventive feature for registering a multimedia object into a database. Specifically, when a multimedia object input from an input section is registered to an object database, data including the multimedia object itself, feature values of the multimedia object, and a category determined by the category setting section based on the feature values, are registered. The system automatically determines recommended categories for the multimedia object by performing a calculation, and displays a list of these recommended categories to the user as pre-selected so that the categories can be easily registered. An additional list of non-recommended categories is also displayed, so that the user can select a category from this list, if appropriate.

Applicant herein amends independent claims 1, 11 and 12 to recite that the category setting section indicates "an initial value of a registration category in a form of

category selection list in which a recommended category is pre-selected and a not-recommended category is not selected, for allowing the user to change the selection status of each category on the category selection list so as to determine the registration category of the multimedia object to be registered”.

By virtue of these features, the claimed system has at least the following advantages. The user can easily confirm recommended and non-recommended categories in the form of a list. In the case where the reliability of the recommended category is high, the recommended category can be determined as a desired category without substantially changing the selected state. Even when the recommended category is changed, only the selected state of the category is changed. In such a manner, the change operation can be easily performed.

Neither Bolle nor Kephart disclose or suggest these features. As the Examiner has acknowledged, Bolle does not disclose or suggest the registration category determined by the user. Kephart discloses producing and displaying a list of one or more categorical labels or folder names (column 7, lines 53-55). The user may elect to click on one of these folder names, or may choose to select from a list of all folders using the standard “File” button (column 8, lines 24-30). Hence, the user must select a category, for example by clicking on a folder name. Kephart does not disclose or suggest a pre-selected category and does not disclose or suggest the user changes the selected state of each category to finally determine a desired category as recited in independent claims 1, 11 and 12.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11 and 12 are patentably distinguished over any art of record in the application and requests that

these claims be allowed. Claims 4-10 depend from claim 1, incorporating all of the features and limitations of the base claim. Thus claims 4-10 are patentably distinguished over any art of record in the application for at least the reasons that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguished over any art of record in the application.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Response, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Katherine R. Vieyra
Registration No. 47,155

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

KRV:vh